

The Manitoba School Question

being
A Controversy

The Rev. E. J. B. SALTER and
The Rev. A. G. MORICE, O.M.I., M.A.

As Published in Letters to
the Winnipeg "Free Press"



Price: 10 Cents

West Canada Publishing Company
WINNIPEG, 1913

LP F5012
1913
SMH



Purchased for the Lorne Pierce Collection
at Queen's University on the
Edith Chown Pierce Trust

112/657.9
PEEL R
242

The Manitoba School Question

being
A Controversy

The Rev. E. J. B. SALTER and
The Rev. A. G. MORICE, O.M.I., M.A.

As Published in Letters to
the Winnipeg "Free Press"



West Canada Publishing Company
WINNIPEG, 1913

F5012
1913.
5177

British Fair Play

and

Religious Toleration

In Winnipeg

Catholics are forced to pay yearly for schools they cannot in conscience use, after which they must pay for the education of their own children, whose school buildings are furthermore taxed by the Protestant majority—making it practically a triple school tax of some \$80,000 which is levied on them.

And In Quebec

the Protestant minority are given schools conducted according to their own religious requirements. They pay only for what they use—not a cent for the Catholic schools.

3027438

FOREWORD

Consequent on the publication of a petition whereby the Catholics of Winnipeg tried to get rid of the burden of a double school tax imposed on them by the Protestant majority of the province, the accompanying controversy took place in the columns of the Manitoba "Free Press." As will appear by the end of Letter X the undersigned, writing under the pseudonym of "Truth," proposed to have it reprinted in pamphlet form, and Letter XVI will tell why he could not concur in the partial publication of the same due to his antagonist.

The whole controversy is herewith presented in a compact form to the public, who will judge of the merits or demerits of the case. Most readers are, no doubt, aware of the fact that an attack or accusation contained in a sentence or two will at times take as many pages to properly refute. Moreover, in answering Mr. Salter I was at the mercy of a periodical controlled by a gentleman who, though fair and liberal-minded, was nevertheless in no sympathy with

the cause I was defending. Hence I had occasionally to leave unanswered or without comment some points of my adversary's letters. What I then omitted for the sake of brevity or any other reason will be found in footnotes throughout the present publication.

As His Grace of St. Boniface has repeatedly declared, a question is settled only when it has been solved according to requirements of justice and equity. Therefore, though the present controversy was prompted by a transitory attempt at relief which was but an episode in the history of the Manitoba schools, as the wrong of which Catholics complain has to this day remained unredressed, and in consideration of a certain step taken by the Provincial Government to conciliate the Catholic electorate, the subject matter of this little pamphlet is more than ever a live question. For that reason it is hoped that its contents will prove of undiminished timeliness and interest.

A. G. MORICE, O.M.I.

Winnipeg, June 1, 1913.

PETITION OF THE WINNIPEG ROMAN
CATHOLICS TO THE SCHOOL
BOARD OF THAT CITY

The petition of the Roman Catholic ratepayers and residents of the city of Winnipeg sheweth as follows:

In order to secure for their children an education both religious and secular, your petitioners organized and established in the city of Winnipeg since 1890 eight private schools, in which 2,029 children of your petitioners are being educated during the present year, entirely at the private cost and expense of the Roman Catholic population of said city, which is now at least 28,000. In these eight schools 39 teachers are now employed. Fully 1,000 children of your petitioners will soon be ready to enter school, and one-half of that number are now nearly of school age. In addition to supporting and maintaining these eight private schools, the Roman Catholic ratepayers of Winnipeg are taxed and have paid taxes to support the public schools of the city, thus bearing a double burden of expense for the purpose of education. An additional charge has been borne by your petitioners because the said school buildings and land in Winnipeg have also been assessed and taxed to maintain the public schools of the city.

The cost to the city of Winnipeg per pupil of the enrolled attendance in the public schools for the year 1911 is \$28.77. This has required an expenditure of \$618,865.00 for 21,508 enrolled pupils, and it is reasonable to estimate that it has cost your petitioners at least a like amount per pupil in their

private schools, or, for 2,029 pupils, \$58,374.33, which is a very serious charge upon your petitioners when it is remembered that they pay a similar proportion of the cost of maintaining the public schools in the city. Your petitioners claim that in their private schools they are providing an efficient education for their children, and the following results furnish an instance of the quality of education being supplied in such schools. In the St. Mary's school the following results were obtained, the entire class having been presented, at the usual entrance examinations held for all years stated: 1910—Pupils presented from St. Mary's, 17—all of whom passed, 3 with honors; 1911—Pupils presented from St. Mary's, 12; of these 11 passed, 6 with honors; 1912—Pupils presented from St. Mary's 20—all of whom passed, 14 with honors.

Your petitioners have a conscientious objection to the character of the present public schools of the city because in them it is not practical to give the children of your petitioners that religious training which they believe should go hand in hand with the secular school work.

For these reasons your petitioners have been laboring under what they feel to be very serious educational disabilities.

The following is a list of the private schools of your petitioners in the city of Winnipeg with the number of teachers in each, the number of pupils in each and grades taught.

St. Mary's school, on St. Mary's avenue—8 teachers, 8 grades, 372 pupils.

Immaculate Conception, on Austin street—5 teachers, 7 grades, 227 pupils.

St. Joseph's school, on College avenue—5 teachers, 7 grades, 250 pupils.

St. Nicholas school, on Flora avenue—5 teachers, 6 grades, 344 pupils.

Holy Ghost school, on Selkirk avenue—5 teachers, 7 grades, 417 pupils.

St. Edward's school, on Notre Dame avenue—4 teachers, 8 grades, 170 pupils.

Sacred Heart school, on Bannatyne avenue—4 teachers, 8 grades, 155 pupils.

St. Ignatius school, Fort Rouge—3 teachers, 6 grades, 104 pupils.

With the exception of the school of the Immaculate Conception which is a wooden building on a stone foundation, thoroughly modern, all the buildings of the other schools are of brick or stone, and are reasonably well equipped and costly buildings.

It is apparent from statements made by members of your board during the past three or four years, that the public schools of this city are crowded to the limit of their capacity, and that it is necessary every year for your board to build immense and costly new public schools to house and accommodate the ever increasing school population of the city, and that it is almost impossible to keep abreast of the demands for school accommodation as witness the present building programme of your board. To properly house the additional school population of your petitioners your building programme for this year would have to be nearly doubled, and it thus be-

comes apparent that your petitioners are and have been bearing a large burden beyond what the other ratepayers of the city bear, and this for conscience's sake.

Your petitioners are informed that in the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick their co-religionists for a time labored under similar disabilities to those which exist in Winnipeg, but some years ago the public school boards in those provinces did what your petitioners propose to you here, and that since then, for fully 20 years past, the arrangement has worked satisfactorily to both parties. We are advised that no legal difficulty exists under the Public school act which would prevent your board from complying with our request as herein contained. Your petitioners feel that as British subjects entitled to full civil and religious liberty they are entitled to have their children educated in accordance with their conscientious convictions and that, although a minority of the population, the civil interests of the province do not demand that the majority should deprive them of the opportunity of enjoying their full civil liberty and freedom in the education of their children, especially when your petitioners are willing that their children should follow the curriculum of the public school system. Our grievances, which have been admitted by the privy council to be well founded, have long been a source of serious irritation, and this will increase with the growth of population, and be detrimental to the best interests of the city and its educational work.

Your petitioners therefore pray—

That your board will take over the schools of your petitioners and operate them under the public schools act and subject

to the control and management of your board.

That you will employ duly qualified teachers in such schools under the requirements of the public schools act, teaching the same course of studies as in all other elementary public schools of the city and subject to the inspection and supervision of your inspectors or superintendents.

That you will lease upon fair terms of rental the buildings of your petitioners, and maintain them, and that you will accord the representatives of your petitioners a reasonable consideration of this petition.

LETTER I.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

THE REQUEST OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC
RATEPAYERS.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—A matter of grave import is at present before the school board of Winnipeg, which is of wider significance than at first appears. That board is asked to take over and operate the Roman Catholic schools of the city, and to lease and maintain their buildings. We love fair play. Let the adherents of that faith have equal rights with all others; but this, which I fear is but one of a procession of concessions sought, means more than the face of it asserts. It would be followed by similar requests through the province, and, I fear by other requests, doubtless already planned, till, by a ruse, separate schools will be granted *in toto*. What would this mean? It would mean that the children of that faith would not have an equal chance in life with others. Although the statistics brought before the board showed that eight of their privately-managed schools, with 2,029 children, succeeded in graduating 20 scholars, 14 of whom passed with honors, by means of 39 teachers, at a cost of \$58,374.33, it would be interesting to know what percentage or what total number of their scholars in Manitoba passed entrance since 1910. They only reported in Winnipeg 48 in all since 1910. How many others were there?

I am not asking this cynically; I am serious. It is an important matter. The children of Roman Catholic parents should have a chance; they are as valuable as other children,

and should be protected. Bishop Fallon, a progressive Roman Catholic bishop, lamented the fact that in Ontario, where their system prevailed, in 9 parishes, with 26,000 children, only 10 passed the entrance; that half the boys confirmed, of the ages between 9 and 15, could not read; that he had offered a gold medal to scholars in other districts who would pass, and in 25 years not one passed. This is the system that I fear. When the act was passed that gave to our province her public schools, the Roman church dissented (1). She claimed that no education was rightly imparted unless accompanied at every stage by the teachings of their creed. They did not ask for religious instruction merely, but for their tenets to be interwoven throughout all their education. It would be impertinent to ask the question, "Has that church changed its opinion?" Were it not for the concerted action of what appears to be an unanimous appeal, we would have asked if certain of its membership were hereby seeking a change of policy as relates to education; but it is easy to see it is a plan, well conceived, and practically unanimously accepted. This means that Winnipeg is asked to rent, support, and generally maintain schools which will teach the faith of one branch of the Christian church to the exclusion of that of others. It is not fair (2). This would give priests admission at all times to do as they do today in the schools of their faith.

I recently visited a school in a Manitoba town. The head-

(1)—He means the Catholic Church.

(2)—Why? Do not Catholics pay for the schooling of their children as well as Protestants? Why should they be forbidden to use their own money to educate those children according to the dictates of their conscience?

master, a Christian but not a Roman Catholic, asked me to speak, but added that no hint of any religious tendency would be tolerated, as there was a child or perhaps two of the Roman faith present, and it would cause trouble. A priest could have spoken, for nobody desires to silence him (3). It is to be regretted that we have such an arrogant, self-seeking and unfair class to deal with, who ask privileges above all others. There are neighborhoods in Manitoba already, where English-speaking people have to privately engage teachers for their children in order to get their education, notwithstanding a school is supported by the province in the neighborhood. I seek not to cast aspersions, but to arouse citizens to a sense of their danger. We are in danger (4). Give one privilege, and they seek many. Recently a colporteur of the Bible Society was in Beausejour with Scriptures. He was asked by the provincial police if he had authority from the priest (5). The priest, not the municipality! Upon him answering that he had not, he was ordered out of town, and compelled to leave. And it is in the neighborhood of that place that English-speaking people seek education for their children in vain.

(3)—Fancy a Catholic priest presuming to speak in a public school, and hear the Orange howling that would deafen our ears as a result!

(4)—How lucky for Manitoba that Protestants have Mr. Salter to watch over their interests! And to say that not a few of them were actually sleeping on the brink of a volcano—that is Catholics trying to get rid of their double school tax—without realizing their danger!

(5)—Having asked the parish priest of Beausejour what he knew of this circumstance, I have received the following answer: "Re your question, nothing is known here in Beauséjour. The provincial police said to me last night: 'Not only did I not arrest any bookseller, but I did not see any here in Beauséjour!' I asked other people about that, but nobody could give me any information. Then all that story is *a principio usque ad finem mendacium*, a lie from beginning to end."

Bear with another fact. Much capital has been made of the statement that we want secular schools and sans religion. It is false. We want what is common to all Christians read, taught and explained by the teachers. But if specific doctrines are asked for that puts one denomination prominently outstanding before all others, let us be fair. Do not brand all non-Roman Catholics as cattle are branded, nor bunch them under a general title of Protestants. Let each denomination have the privilege accorded to any one of them. The Christians of the Roman faith are a sect of the Church of Christ (6). Let them be treated impartially, but receive no special privilege; and let Winnipeg build her own schools and conduct them according to law without complicity with any sect of Christians.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Dec. 11.

(6)—How considerate! We always thought that a "sect" was, according to the etymology and received signification of the word, a limb "cut off" from the body, and that it was the Protestant factions that seceded from the existing Church of Christ, not the latter that seceded from them.

LETTER II.

By "Truth."

THE CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I believe that few questions have been the occasion of so much nonsense as the Manitoba school question. The number of misrepresentations and fanciful appreciations to which it has given rise is simply marvellous. Hence I cannot help thinking that many rush into print and vent their bile and bigotry before a suffering public who have not made any real study of the merits and demerits of the case. Historically speaking, the whole difficulty is simply this: It is part of the belief of the Catholic Church that education and religion must go hand in hand. Protestants may on this point disagree with her; but to prevent the offspring of Catholics from being educated according to their conscience is nothing short of persecution. When, in 1869, the Catholics of Manitoba objected to their being incorporated into the newly-formed Confederation of Canada without some guarantee that they should be protected in their religious persuasions—an objection in which the imperial government expressly concurred, as is shown in Morice's "History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada"—they formulated their desiderata in a bill of rights, all the points of which were conceded by the Ottawa government, as appears by the act which became the constitution of Manitoba.

This was a contract which was, of course, binding until both parties should consent to its being altered. One of the

clauses of this contract granted separate schools to Catholics; but, in spite of the strenuous protests of one of the two contracting parties, and in defiance of the constitution which "might be against us," as the notorious Joe Martin then confessed, those schools were abolished in 1890. Long litigation ensued, which culminated in the Privy Council deciding that the Catholics had a real grievance, and were justified in seeking redress at the hands of the parliament of Canada. This redress was sought; but, under the plea that he would give them more satisfaction than was offered by those then in power, Mr. W. Laurier managed to become premier of the dominion. He then did what few others would have thought of: he attempted to settle the question without even consulting the aggrieved party. The result of that novel policy was a lame compromise which has never been accepted by those whose constitutional rights had been violated.

For, Mr. Editor, let not the opponents of separate schools in Manitoba forget it: the Catholics of this city do not ask for any privilege; they simply want their rights. The Manitoba act of 1870, which represents the contract to which they were a party, gives them the right to educate their children according to the dictates of their conscience, and no legislature of a lower order can legitimately invalidate what a superior body has done.

Hence people who are conversant with the history of this country cannot cease wondering at the incredible distortions of facts, due to political parsons and others, which find their way into the public press, any more than they can see the *raison d'être* of their homilies against the granting of special privileges

to Catholics. Some of these effusions are pure rant, and betray minds which, while constantly prating about fair play, want it only for themselves and theirs. Take, for instance, the letter of a man who signed E. J. B. Salter, which was published by the Free Press but two days ago. Few communications could beat it for general unfairness, inaccuracy of statements, and the insultingly patronizing tone with which it refers to the Catholic children of this city. It would take too much of your valuable space to point out in detail all his misconceptions, nay misrepresentations. I must confine myself to a few of the most glaring ones.

Mr. Salter does not fail to commence by that hypocritical profession of good will towards Catholics, which Dr. DuVal and other agitators of his ilk have made an inevitable preliminary to the most scurrilous charges against the Catholic Church. "Let the adherents of that faith have equal rights with all others," remarks Mr. Salter. That is just what we ask. Protestants have and use the right to educate their children according to their conscience; let Catholics enjoy the same with regard to their own. The education given in Winnipeg public schools satisfies the majority of Protestants. They are welcome to it, but no conscientious Catholic can be content with the same. Mr. Salter and others may say that they ought to be; the fact remains that they are not and they will never be. To force them to pay double tax, as has been done since 1890, is nothing short of persecution.

But, in his solicitude for the public weal, Mr. Salter is much concerned about the inefficiency of the Catholic schools, which it is proposed to place under management which di-

rects the public schools of this city. He pities the poor Catholic children, and considerately begs that they be given "an equal chance in life with others." This is, of course, very kind of him, and Catholics should be monsters of iniquity if they did not vow him eternal gratitude. Yet I cannot help suspecting the motive of that unwonted generosity. I must also be allowed to probe some of his assertions in this connection. He would fain give as a sign of inferiority the fact that last year the Catholic schools of this city succeeded in graduating only 20 of their scholars. In the first place, I must say that graduating for the high school is not by any means a fair test of a school's efficiency. Because of the particular conditions prevailing in Manitoba, few Catholic students, aspire to the position of school teacher. Therefore, some of their schools do not care to send any pupils to the provincial examinations. They prefer to see them try the commercial colleges of the city. But when their pupils do compete, they usually meet with a measure of success which the public school might well envy.

And then, is it true that only 20 of them succeeded in their examinations last year? Why, in two schools alone, namely, St. Mary's Academy and St. Mary's parochial school, no less than 37 pupils then passed entrance! In the latter a whole class of 20 pupils passed, 14 of them with honors (7)! I challenge any one to quote better results achieved by any public school. But what about the other Catholic schools of the

(7)—It would be creditable enough for a large class to have 20 picked pupils pass; but that a whole class, without a single exception, should meet with such a success is, I believe, something almost unheard of.

province? asks Mr. Salter. Let me give him two examples. At the institution of the Sisters of the Holy Names in St. Boniface 18 out of 19 passed, and in the French rural parish of St. Pierre the 6 girls who presented themselves passed, and all of them with honors, though, in addition with the English course, they had to study their own native language. Not so bad, I should say, for poor benighted Catholic children for whom kind Mr. Salter craves the favor of "an equal chance in life with others," and who, he declares, "should be protected," presumably against the ignorance in which his bigoted mind fancies they are sunk! Nay, it is a well-known fact among local Catholic educationalists that children who leave the Winnipeg public schools for any of the Catholic schools have generally to be put in a grade lower than that in which they were, owing to their inability to follow the corresponding one in the latter institutions.

I know personally two children of the bilingual school attached to the French parish of this city who lately got 100 per cent. at the Winnipeg Business College, and, though these children are of French parentage and comparatively new to this city, I honestly believe that they could correct Mr. Salter's English. At any rate, they would not be guilty of a sentence like this:—"She' claimed that no education was rightly imparted unless accompanied at every step by the teaching of 'their' creed," which I cull from his elucubration.

But one single fact should silence Mr. Salter and friends and force them to keep their pity and patronizing ways for their own institutions. Why is it that fully one-quarter, if not one-third, of the scholars of St. Mary's Academy do not profess the Catholic faith? Of course, it is well known that their

parents appreciate the atmosphere of purity and lady-like gentleness which pervades the whole establishment. But they know also that its teachers are exceptionally well qualified for their task— some of them enjoying even university degrees—and that their exertions have so far been crowned with almost uniform success.

One more word and I close this already too long communication. It is, I think, necessary to show what degree of reliability such firebrands as Mr. Salter and compeers possess. He unhesitatingly asserts that Bishop Fallon "had offered a gold medal to scholars who would pass, and in 25 years not one passed." In the first place, Dr. Fallon never spoke of the separate schools, and secondly he has only been a bishop two years.

TRUTH.

Winnipeg, Dec. 19.

LETTER III.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—Mr. "Truth" has written an article in which he endeavors to answer statements with quibbles. He uses sarcasm also, which is a terrible weapon, but dangerous. I was alarmed to be accused of inaccuracy and insult, but was set at ease by being classed with "Dr. DuVal and other agitators of his ilk." I feel honored by being classed with the venerable and worthy champion, whose sermons, and speeches, ever unanswerable, breathe liberty and equality in every utterance (8). But note, sir, how I am answered. Mr. Truth said he could not "take too much of your valuable space to point out in detail all my misconceptions, so chose "the most glaring." What are they? A grammatical error is one. Surely I am unanswerable when such a quibble takes such valuable space (9). But, sir, is it a grammatical error? Please read this. "She" [the Church] "claimed that no education was rightly imparted unless accompanied at every step by their [the localities] creed," Note, "She" claims she never changes;

(8)—Rev. Mr. Salter is quite welcome to the comfort which he may find in his being associated with such an intolerant busy-body as Dr. DuVal, whose vagaries have time and again been victoriously refuted in the "Northwest Review" and other periodicals.

(9)—Far from being an unimportant quibble this fact throws, on the contrary, a valuable light on the qualifications of the doctor that would fain cure others who are healthier than himself. *Medice, cura te ipsum.*

"They" do not teach the same in every place. "She" agrees that what "they" teach is necessary to education. They teach in some places that I am a heretic. She says so, too. They teach in other places that I am a Protestant merely, and to this she agrees. I stand by my original sentence.

Again Mr. Truth informs us that Roman Catholics wish religion and education to go hand in hand. Protestants he says "may" disagree to this. This word is carefully chosen. He dared not say "do" disagree. He knows better. We are denied any religion with our lessons by the Roman Catholic Church asserting that the only religion that shall be taught is the creed "She" espouses (10). Mr. Truth knows all Christians want education and religion in their schools. But we are refused religion on the common basis of equally accepted truths, and prefer a clause allowing half an hour of each day for religious exercises, to creeds which favor one section. It is a purely gratuitous assertion that "the education given in the Winnipeg public schools satisfies the majority of Protestants." Please note. Let all readers note. He further says "no conscientious Catholic can be content with the same." Let us note this well, and ask what it is the petitioners seek when they ask the Winnipeg school board to take over the eight Roman Catholic schools, to rent them, to maintain them, and to remember that no conscientious Catholic can be content with the education of the Winnipeg public schools. Let me ask what will they be content with? We all know that

(10)—This is, of course, a gratuitous assertion. The Catholic Church, as is proven in Quebec and elsewhere, is in favor of the Protestants educating their own children in the religion they please, provided those of the Catholics are given the same privilege.

they are asking for public money to teach private creeds. He admits this much. Is this fair? Is it equitable?

He further states that the Roman Catholics pay double tax. Mr. Editor, it is not so. I pay my taxes in Winnipeg. I also pay my church dues. Mr. Truth does no more.

The next appeal is to history. This is especially unfortunate for the Roman Catholics, for the subject has been threshed out in courts of appeal at great length, and we are not ignorant of the decision, but we abide by it, leaving it where the courts placed it.

As to the point of efficiency in Roman Catholic scholars, is it not an evident begging the question when in reply to my question asking for how many graduates their schools produced in Manitoba we read this:

"Few Catholic students aspire to the position of school teacher," and again "some of their schools do not care to send any pupils to the provincial examinations." Need I comment? Well might he add that "when their pupils do compete," their success is enviable. I agree with him; and any scholar who graduates despite the fact that his school does not want him to do so, has something in him. His success is enviable.

Re Bishop Fallon. The fact that he was bishop only two years does not surely deny the fact that he offered a gold medal to any who should graduate during a longer period of years (10a). The point I aimed at, and which was avoided, was, that he was not called upon to redeem his promise in those parishes.

(10a)—Does that allow you to say that "in 25 years not one passed"? The 23 years to come are surely not included in the 2 that have elapsed since he was a bishop.

But, Mr. Editor, the real issue is this: The school board of Winnipeg is asked to take over eight Roman Catholic schools with between thirty and forty teachers and at an expense of nearly sixty thousand dollars annually, exclusive of rental which would be added to conduct and maintain these schools for a class who cannot conscientiously be content with the Winnipeg school system. Some of us feel and desire to express our belief that Winnipeg should build and equip her own schools (11); first because old schools are not built and equipped for present needs, and, secondly, because the Winnipeg schools should have no complicity with creeds. We protest against schools with special privileges being maintained with general funds, and I ask all fair-minded citizens of all creeds to take interest in maintaining the right. With goodwill to all and malice to none.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Dec, 21.

(11)—Partly at the expense of Catholics who cannot use them.

LETTER IV.

By "Truth."

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—Mr. E. J. B. Salter is out again with a letter on the Catholic schools of this city which he would fain pass off as a reply to my own communication of the 19th inst. Unable to dispute the accuracy of my historical exposé of the Manitoba school question, or to escape the natural conclusion that Catholics seek no privilege, but demand their strict rights under the Constitution; powerless also against the crushing answer I gave to his accusations against the Catholic schools of Winnipeg, he now tries to save his dignity by pretending that I "answer statements with quibbles," while his own last effort is little more than a juggling with words and a constant evasion of the real point at issue. Nay, in this new letter he does not even shrink from distorting the meaning of my statements and making assertions which he ought to know are contrary to facts. I cannot but think that my opponent underrates the intelligence of his readers if he imagines that they will not guess the real reason of such tactics.

Mr. Salter had plainly disparaged the Catholic schools and pitied their pupils, who, he contended, should be given a chance equal to that enjoyed by those of the public schools. I answered him by declaring that the former were fully up to the standard of the latter, because, 1st., children coming from the public into the Catholic schools had generally to be put in a lower grade; 2nd, the proportion of the Catholic pupils who passed entrance was far above what he thought; 3rd, a number of the best Protestant families of this city and the country were sending their children to St. Mary's Academy, and 4th,

judging from their success at the Business Colleges, even Catholic students of French parentage could correct his own English. Was not this straightforward and to the point? No, answers Mr. Salter, this is nothing but quibbling! He had affirmed that in the course of 25 years Bishop Fallon had not found one pupil of the separate schools to win the medal for entrance, and in answer I had assured him that, 1st., Dr. Fallon had been a bishop only two years, and 2nd., he had never spoken of the separate schools. But to that great logician who is known under the name of E. J. B. Salter this is again no disproof, but a mere quibble! And how does he himself answer my plainest statements? By the most unadulterated quibbling. I had said that, because of the particular conditions prevailing in Manitoba, "few Catholic students aspire to the position of school teacher," and that "some of their schools do not care to send any pupils to the provincial examinations;" whereupon he now exclaims that when these do compete their success is enviable because, forsooth, "any scholar who graduates despite the fact that his school does not want him to do so has something in him," as if I had said, or it could logically be inferred, that any of the Catholic pupils ever presented themselves "in spite of" their school, and forgetting that he had just quoted my remark that "few of them aspire to the position of school teacher." A man who is reduced to such tactics must either be defending a very bad cause or his reasoning faculties are not of the best.

Speaking of the success at the examinations of such Catholic scholars as did present themselves thereto, I had written: "I challenge anyone to quote better results achieved by any public school." Does my opponent take up the gauntlet? Not he.

He simply dodges the question and, instead of manfully admitting that his English was at fault or letting that point drop, he now uses some subterfuge to make it appear that the incriminated sentence was correct. You may explain it away as you please, my dear sir; the fact remains that you had a possessive pronoun in the plural which neither in that sentence nor in the context could be referred to any plural noun. This is too clear to be insisted on. Moreover, it is unimportant, except as a new illustration of the appositeness of the Latin proverb: *Medice, cura te ipsum*: Doctor, cure thyself first.

More important are Mr. Salter's new inaccuracies. He claims that the Catholics are the cause of the lack of religion in the public schools. Yet he knows full well that for the last 22 years they have had nothing to do with them, nor have they at any time manifested their readiness to use them if they were shorn of the kind of religious teaching which Mr. Salter would seemingly see in them. That gentleman further considers as gratuitous my assertion that "the education given in the Winnipeg public schools satisfies the majority of Protestants." Then why don't they change the nature of those schools? Is it Catholics or Protestants that rule over them?

He adds concerning the Catholics of this city: "We all know that they are asking for public money to teach private creeds." "He admits this much," he further says of my humble person. I, on the contrary, deny it absolutely, and Mr. Salter has no warrant to attribute this pretension to me. What Catholics want is to have their own money or its equivalent applied to the education of their children. In other words, they protest against what might be called the shame of Winnipeg, that is forcing people to pay for schools to which they have

conscientious objections.

And here comes the very climax of Mr. Salter's unfairness: he goes so far as to formally declare that Catholics do not pay double tax! Why, Mr. Editor, ever since 1890 Catholics have had to pay not only double, but triple tax, and Mr. Salter ought to know it. They pay, first, the common tax for the public schools which they cannot use; then their school buildings are themselves taxed to assist in the maintenance of the very edifices which they are intended to replace as far as their own children are concerned, and, in the third place, they have to tax themselves to keep up the only schools which their conscience allows of. Mr. Salter was indeed most unfortunate in his choice of this particular point. I hold—and I hope you will not object to my stating—that no fair-minded Protestant can possibly think of this blemish on the escutcheon of Manitoba without feeling something akin to shame steal up into his mind and heart. Indeed, I know several who frankly admit that they are sick of seeing their fellow British subjects yearly pay for institutions which they cannot use, and this in spite of the fact that these fellow subjects are as a rule poorer than themselves.

The main facts of the case, which Mr. Salter does not even dare controvert, much less deny, are those: The Catholics of what is today Manitoba entered the Canadian Confederation on the distinct understanding that they would continue to have their separate schools. This contract was ruthlessly broken in 1890, whereupon they applied to divers tribunals, the highest of which decided in 1895 that they had a real grievance and that they were justified in seeking redress. That redress has never been granted them, since they still suffer

from the very injustice—paying double and triple tax—which was so clearly set forth in the judgment of the Privy Council. When that grievance has been done away with, but not before, will Mr. Salter and others be justified in writing that they “abide by” the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire.

In the meantime, I must congratulate my opponent on his abstaining from tacking the epithets “arrogant, self-seeking and unfair” to the Catholic priesthood of this city, as he had done in his first letter. Perhaps he now surmises that “Truth” is not a stranger to the Winnipeg priests. He also wisely refrains from his original aspersions on our Catholic schools, coming no doubt to realize their undisputable efficiency. It only remains for him to stick to the point, abstain from quibbles and avoid wild assertions which any schoolboy can disprove to become a model adversary.

TRUTH.

Winnipeg, Dec. 26.

LETTER V.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir—It ill becomes the dignity of our discussion to recriminate with aspersions. The issue at stake is too serious to be lost in bickering. Here are the facts: A section of our citizens are appealing to the Winnipeg school board with this proposition:

First—No conscientious Romanist (12) can be satisfied with your school system.

Second—We cannot have our children take instruction that is not taught from the Roman Catholic Church and her agents.

Third—We ask the Winnipeg school board to take over our buildings, to pay us rent for them, to pay our teachers and to so change the course of instruction, as to make, by means of special privilege, an exception in these schools.

Mr. Editor, there are some things that appear so fair to easy-going people that their sense of justice concedes the point at once. I would mention a few, but they would form the basis of another letter and we must keep to the point. We also wish to be fair and just, but I wish to show why I believe this should not be allowed.

No section should be allowed to control the text books and curriculum for any district of our city. If no conscientious per-

(12)—By this opprobrious nickname Mr. Salter means "Catholic."

son of that section can be content with our system, and if, further, that section claims to be superior to our own, relegating our children to lower grades because they have not studied French or church history, let the question be asked in every letter: What do they want? They want public funds to teach private creeds.

No old buildings should be engaged by our school board, for they are not what we want. Our schools should be built and maintained and owned by the school board or the city and they cannot be too modern.

If this were permitted, see what it leads to. It means separate schools for everybody. Why should the Romanists (13) be singled out for this privilege? Our Jews, our Lutherans, cannot be content altogether with our public school system. Their love of religion would make them hail with delight a system that would combine it with education. But, like ourselves they yield for the public good. I would make almost any sacrifice to have religion and education combined, but it cannot be done where every religion receives equal credence from the State. The trouble has largely arisen from the concession made to the church that speaks of itself as a unit and combines all others together as another unit. "Protestants and Roman Catholics" is not a fair distinction, and when this is seen, it will be no longer possible for a section to ask for special privilege as though there were only two classes to deal with (14). Believe me, here is the seat of the trouble. In order for

(13)—Another offensive term whereby Mr. Salter means the Catholics.

(14)—I am sorry for Mr. Salter, but I am afraid it will be hard for him to change those conditions and alter the popular and legal usage which consecrates them.

separate schools to be fair, it would be necessary to break up our whole educational system and to permit each sect to institute a religious education.

In conclusion, permit an answer to Rev. Father Truth. If children coming from our schools have to be set down a grade on entering theirs, it is either because they cannot pass the religious grade test, or he may refer to some one school that is specially made the centre of effort. He himself will admit that when 20 graduates were produced from St. Mary's with so large a degree of honorable mentions, it was the concentrated effort of Roman Catholicism perhaps for all Manitoba, certainly for a large district. Will he declare the country school education of the R. C. C. schools is equal to our own without regard to church standards? Why I can show schools in Manitoba where English-speaking people have to engage private tutors to instruct their children, even though the school is supported by public funds. "Truth" speaks of the success of the Roman Catholic children in the business colleges of Winnipeg. I fail to see what this proves. I trust we all believe Roman Catholic pupils to be equal to any others when their opportunity is equal. He asks who controls "our schools?" I answer that in the issue at stake, the Roman Catholics do (15). Our secular system is a concession to them, that they may be without excuse on religious grounds. Nor will this issue ever be settled until all concessions cease, and education becomes compulsory. He tells us, lastly, of some who are sick of seeing their fellow British subjects pay for institutions they

(15)—*Risum teneatis, amici*, do not burst into laughter at this incongruous assertion!

cannot use in spite of the fact they are poorer than themselves. Let me ask why the Roman Catholics are poorer than any others in this country? Why does he admit they are poorer? What and who makes them so? And, finally, I pay for institutions I do not use. I support asylums and jails, but do not use them. Mr. Editor, I close with the same appeal—Equal Rights for All, Special Privileges for None.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Dec. 28.

LETTER VI.

By "Truth."

THE CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I fail to see the object of Mr. Salter's new letter published in your issue of last Tuesday unless it be to give me another chance of pointing out his inaccuracies and inconsistencies, and to show me how impervious a man can be to the cogency of the most direct reasoning. His new communication seems to be chiefly made up of statements which I have already refuted and of questions which have long been answered. Thus he still keeps harping on pretended privileges which I have proved to be the clearest of rights under the Constitution and according to the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire. But my opponent seems to ignore completely the former and to have very little concern with regard to the latter. The judges of the Privy Council had taken the trouble to describe the wrong done to the minority of 1890, saying: "While the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent to the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctly Protestant in their character." They therefore decided that Catholics had the "right" to see this grievance redressed. Now, let Mr. Salter be frank and to the point: has there been any change in the conditions pointed out by the Privy Council? Are not the Catholic schools in Winnipeg still handicapped by the very same

difficulties? Of course, they are; even he could not deny it. Why then should he oppose an arrangement which is intended to give Catholics some measure of relief in conformity with the directions of the solemn judgment by which but the other day he professed to abide? Let him answer this and not take refuge in any side issue. Why should he now call privilege what the Privy Council gave out as a right?

But, Mr. Editor, not only does Mr. Salter seem unable to appreciate the strength of an argument, but when driven into a corner he attempts to escape by what I must call the flimsiest of answers. He had at first dared assert that Catholics did not pay double school tax. He now stoops to such a miserable subterfuge as this: "I pay for institutions I do not use. I support asylums and jails, but do not use them." In the face of such a novel piece of reasoning, I cannot help asking whether he is serious or if he simply intends to throw dust into the eyes of simpletons. Why, Sir, I mean no offense, but I honestly believe that there are some in the asylums to which he refers who can be more logical. It stands to reason that schools being intended for all—and Mr. Salter should be the last to forget it, since he wants education to be made compulsory—cannot possibly be compared with institutions which are only made for a few. Moreover, by paying for the latter, he and I contribute to the welfare of society and thereby provide for our personal security; but what advantages do Catholics derive from schools for which they have to pay twice—individual and by means of the taxes on their own school buildings—though, in the words of the judges of the Privy Council themselves, such schools are in their estimation "no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were dis-

tinctly Protestant in their character?"

Here my adversary jumps aside to ask why "the Roman Catholics are poorer than any others in this country." May I myself ask for the reason of this curiosity? Surely, the cause of this state of affairs has nothing to do with the subject at issue, though the fact that such a state does exist goes a long way towards rendering still more odious the injustice of which Catholics have been the victims for the last 22 years. But if Mr. Salter insists on learning why our people are generally poorer than others, I will whisper into his ear that this arises chiefly from the fact that they are more virtuous. Race suicide is unknown among them, and it does not require any extra brilliancy of mind to understand that a large family is more difficult to support than a small one.

Another quibble of Mr. Salter's consists in his contention, now twice expressed, that the Catholics are themselves responsible for the absence of religion in the city public schools. This is not worth any other answer than that which I already vouchsafed. I am sure my opponent does not himself believe what he says in this connection, or if he does this betrays on his part a mental condition which would be proof against all arguments.

He further claims that "no section should be allowed to control the text books and curriculum for any district of our city." I wonder whether this is because of his fear to see disappear from among the school books of the public schools a certain history which has been proved to contain no less than eleven inaccuracies in one single page (see Morice's "History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada," vol. II, p. 401).

As to his implied statement that Protestants have themselves real objections to the public schools being without religion, but that "they yield for the public good," I beg leave to dissent. I know Protestants well enough and have too many friends among them not to feel that this is a real, though unintended, slight on their conscientiousness. I cannot persuade myself that if they had the same scruples as Catholics in this respect they would stifle the voice of their conscience to the extent of spurning its dictates in a matter of such importance to the welfare of their children.

Nor will I stop to consider Mr. Salter's contention that granting separate schools to Catholics would entail the establishment of similar institutions for each of the Protestant sects. This is a trick so transparent that everyone can see through it. We all remember the Logan case and its intent, but this cannot make us forget that the decision of the Privy Council mentions only the Catholics as having a right to separate schools. Furthermore, will Mr. Salter kindly tell me which one of the sects bargained for, and was granted, separate schools in 1870? Let us be logical and abstain from difficulties which have no⁴ right to exist.

A last word as to the efficiency of the Catholic schools of this city. My opponent writes: "If children coming from our schools have to be set down a grade on entering theirs it is because they cannot pass the religious grade test or he [meaning "Truth"] may refer to some one school that is specially made the centre of effort." I beg to assure Mr. Salter that he is mistaken in either hypothesis. Absolutely no religious test is required of any Protestant in our schools, and I had reference

in this connection to three different Catholic schools of this city. His supposition in another part of his letter that we base this superiority of our scholars on their knowledge of French is equally gratuitous. In fact, as far as St. Mary's school is concerned, I have my doubts about any of its male teachers knowing enough French to be able to teach it.

As to the Catholic schools in the country, I have already reduced to their just value my opponent's innuendoes. To the successes at examinations I mentioned I shall now add that of the pupils of another French parish, that of St. Jean-Baptiste, where six (all those that presented themselves) passed entrance and five of them with honors. The two girls who succeeded so well at the Business College—for which Mr. Salter seems to entertain such supreme scorn—were French children, hailing from the parish of Ile des Chênes.

From all of which I think we are warranted in concluding: Respect to the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire and no double tax for any class of citizens, especially when those citizens have shown themselves able to keep their own against heavy odds.

TRUTH.

Winnipeg, January 2.

P.S.—At the very last minute I learn that all of the four young ladies of St. Mary's Academy who lately presented themselves for the University examinations passed, though the number of scholars who failed is exceptionally large this year. Since Mr. Salter believes "Roman Catholic pupils to be equal to any others when their opportunity is equal," I hope he will

admit that said opportunity, that is their schooling, is at least equal to that of non-Catholics, since they succeeded where others failed.

T.

LETTER VII.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—When a debater continually proclaims victory to himself he may mislead some, but cannot disguise from others his failure to touch the vital point (16). I had rather leave others to judge the merits of my arguments than to be both contestant and judge. My opponent "Truth" accuses me of harping on my subject of the special privileges asked by the Roman Catholics of Winnipeg. Mr. Editor, it is the very point under discussion, and if I can be the means of bringing this point out clearly, it is all I ask. I must harp upon it because it is the especial point my friend "Truth" will not meet. No answer is given to my continued statement which I make, that in asking the Winnipeg School Board to take over their schools they are also asking to continue the Roman Catholic Church doctrines in the curriculum of the schools (17). I state this is not fair. If they asked the Winnipeg School Board to take over their children and provide them with instruction, we would all unite with them in the reasonable request (18).

(16)—What is that "vital point?" Mr. Salter says a few lines later that it is the "subject of special privileges." Now have I not been all along protesting against (therefore "touching") my opponent's unwarranted assumption of any such privileges being asked by us?

(17)—Of course, Mr. Salter knows quite well that we want this only for our own schools.

(18)—Mr. Salter means that it would be "reasonable" to ask that our children be instructed in defiance of our conscience.

But we object to the petition to take over schools, equipment and doctrine together. This is my whole contention.

The Roman Catholic people do not want their children instructed as other children are taught, but they ask for a special exception to be made in the case of the Roman Catholic scholars, and, further, ask that these be taught in buildings now owned by the Roman Catholic Church, and that the Roman Catholic Church be paid rent and be relieved of all expenses in connection with the buildings. Will my friend answer me. Is this not what they ask? Of course, we also know who would be engaged as teachers (19). There is no public school in Winnipeg where a teacher, in making application to the School Board, has to state "I am a Methodist" or "I am a Christian Scientist." Why should a denominational school be created (20)?

I will take no space to defend my "mental condition" or to answer personalities re the asylum. I am in better business. But note this. Mr. Truth says, "No conscientious Roman Catholic can be satisfied with our school system." He states that children are often set down a grade when leaving our schools for theirs. He tells you our schools are not suitable for Roman Catholic children, and now he says there are eleven inaccuracies on one page of one of our school text-books. And yet in the face of all these things he asks the Winnipeg School

(19)—They would be "duly qualified teachers," according to the very petition of the Catholics. What more does Mr. Salter want?

(20)—Because the Privy Council decided that the right to such schools possessed by Catholics in virtue of the Constitution has been interfered with by the 1890 legislation, and that they have a right to have the grievance created by this encroachment redressed.

Board to take the Roman Catholic Church schools in hand. If our schools are so inferior, whatever is it he hopes to gain?

It is evident by his letter that my opponent is proud of St. Mary's academy. From the petition presented to the board, to this last letter, St. Mary's is in evidence. He will soon convince me of the correctness of my last letter, in which I said the Roman Catholic people specialized on one school, which they could use as an argument. It serves a good purpose here. The success of that school doubtless lies in the fact that it is not bilingual, and that the men who teach there do not know enough of French to teach it.

But I have reserved for the last the decision of the Privy Council. I am surprised to see an appeal made to this decision. If "the Privy Council gave out as a right" to the Roman Catholic Church the privilege now asked for, let me ask why they do not exercise this right (21)? Is there any privilege accorded them by law they do not fully enjoy? Is it not well known they always agitate for larger concessions? No other people bring their special sect so fully forward; none others seek the recognition they ask of all nations. But did the Privy Council decide in their favor? Read my quotations and see.

Barrett and Lovan v. Winnipeg—on the 30th day of July, 1892, the following judgment was given (of course abridged): That the Manitoba Act, 1870, declared that the provisions of the B.N.A. Act should be applicable (with exceptions) to Manitoba. That nothing shall prejudicially affect denominational schools which any class have at the time of union.

(21)—How naive! Why, simply because the legislation condemned by that high tribunal has not yet been abrogated!

"There were," said the judges, "no rights or privileges with respect to denominational schools existing by law." There existed denominational schools. The means for the support were supplied by fees paid by parents of children who attended the school and by the funds of the church." This privilege, the document goes on to say, yet exists. They may still support these schools if they wish. "But," in their lordships' opinion, "it would be going too far to hold that the establishment of a national system of education upon an unsectarian basis is so inconsistent with the right to set up and maintain denominational schools that the two things cannot exist together or that the existence of one necessarily implies or involves immunity from taxation for the purpose of the other." "In 1890," said their lordships, "the denominational system of public education was entirely swept away." Again, "The public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian and no religious exercises shall be allowed therein except as above provided." And the decision was that the Roman Catholics were free to maintain schools if they wished to, and to support them. They have that privilege yet. The Privy Council decided that they "cannot assent to the view, . . . that the public schools under the act of 1890 are in reality Protestant schools. The legislature has declared the public schools shall be entirely unsectarian."

Hear the final word of the Privy Council:—"Their lordships cannot help observing that if the views of the respondents were to prevail that the power of the legislature. . . . would be limited to the useful but somewhat humble office of making regulations for the sanitary conditions of school houses."

etc. (22). I ask, Mr. Editor, for the whole controversy to be read over and judge between us which is the just cause.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Jan. 8.

(22)—Later on, the same tribunal did admit that the power of the Provincial Legislature is *not* absolute.

LETTER VIII.

By "Truth."

CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I must congratulate Mr. E. J. B. Salter on his having, for the first time since the beginning of our little controversy, tried to stick to the subject at issue and answer the plain question I had put to him concerning the "rights" in school matters which Catholics derive from the Manitoba act and the last decision of the Privy Council. I had written: "That supreme tribunal decided that Catholics had the 'right' to see this grievance redressed. Now, let Mr. Salter be frank and to the point; has there been any change in the conditions pointed out by the Privy Council?" Thus cornered, and accused moreover of caring little for that decision, my opponent now sees himself forced to come to the crux of the whole question. He answers by a query: "Did the Privy Council decide in their favor?" he asks, meaning the Catholics. Whereupon he adds: "Read my quotations and see." I read his quotations and see, what? Extracts from the final judgment of 1895, to which I referred? By no means; simply passages from a previous decision, that of 1892, which bore on a different subject and was, for all practical purposes, superseded by that of 1895! Is that honest? Mr. Salter objects to my referring to his mental condition, though the unique quality of his dialectics inevitably leads one to inquire into it. Therefore, I must state that this is either ignorance or bad faith. In neither case has that gentleman the right to appeal to, or try to influence, public opinion.

In 1892 Catholics contended that the Manitoba school legislation of 1890 was *ultra vires*, that is, beyond the attributions of the provincial legislature. The lords of the Privy Council, before whom it is well known that the case had been very improperly pleaded by an incompetent and ill-prepared advocate, who was constantly confounding the educational situation of Manitoba with that of eastern Canada, decided that the Catholics were wrong in their contention, and that the legislature of this province had the right to make laws concerning the kind of education that should prevail in this country. Catholics received that decision with respect, and now abide by it. But later on, in January, 1895, the same tribunal found out that, though the 1890 legislation was theoretically *intra vires*, the Catholics had none the less been wronged by it, and that they had a "right" to seek redress from the grievance it created. Mr. Salter must have been aware that this is the judgment on which we have always based our claim to relief from the unjust situation in which we find ourselves ever since 1890, for when referring to it I had expressly mentioned the year 1895 (see my second letter). He cannot, therefore, plead ignorance, and since I am now debarred from questioning his sanity, I have but one alternative open to me, that is that he knows he is again away from the question and tries to throw dust into the eyes of the ignorant.

I have before me the full text of that famous finding and of all the others that bear on the case; but it is too long and too involved to allow of my quoting therefrom more than I did in my last communication. I will only add that the government of Canada officially acknowledged (March 19, 1895) that "the decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council

in the cases of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg and Logan vs. the City of Winnipeg, does not dispose of, or conclude, the application for redress based on the contention that the rights of the Roman Catholic minority which accrued to them after the union under the statutes of the province have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890," which, in other words, means that the judgment of 1892 is not a denial of their right to redress, as Mr. Salter would fain have us believe.

Will now that gentleman understand why I "continually proclaim victory to myself?" Could he quote a single point on which he has proven me at fault? Given the lie and shown to be at variance with facts as regards the stand taken by Bishop Fallon, the efficiency of the Catholic schools of Winnipeg and the country, the number of our children who passed entrance and succeeded in their university examinations, the nature of the tuition they receive, the basis for the action of our teachers in setting Protestant pupils a grade lower in our own schools, as well as the most unjust position of the Catholics, who are forced to pay double and triple tax, he is now shown to be dishonest in quoting from a judgment which he knows to have been practically set aside by a later pronouncement. Formally challenged to name a non-Catholic school with greater success than that of St. Mary's, he suddenly becomes deaf and keeps mum on that subject. Now, could I do otherwise than claim victory?

But, Mr. Editor, I attribute to myself no special merit; Mr. Salter is simply defending a hopeless cause. By no manner of decent argumentation can the practical helotism of Catholics in Winnipeg be upheld, nor can the thousands upon thousands

of dollars yearly extorted from them for institutions they cannot use be justified. Hence, to go on with this controversy, my opponent must have recourse to irrelevant issues, which unfortunately result in deception.

I have just mentioned St. Mary's school. Mr. Salter is so much at sea on the subject he so imprudently took up, and is getting so mixed that he now confounds St. Mary's Academy with St. Mary's parochial school, though I had several times differentiated these establishments. I had mentioned St. Mary's parish, and therefore primary, school for boys and girls, and it seems to me that he ought to know that when I referred to the success at the university examinations of some of the scholars of St. Mary's Academy I had not in mind the former institution. It is not usual for a primary school to prepare for the university degrees. But there are people who are never so bold as when they speak of subjects with which they are not familiar.

Mr. Salter writes: "He [meaning "Truth"] tells you our schools are not suitable for Roman Catholic children, and now he says there are eleven inaccuracies in one of our school textbooks.... If our schools are so inferior, whatever is it he hopes to gain?" Why, methinks that my friend is getting not a little naive. I and Catholics want the kind of schools that are better and do not teach historical inaccuracies. Is not that ambition legitimate?

Then, after having triumphantly quoted from the wrong judgment, he writes: "I ask, Mr. Editor, for the whole controversy to be read over and judge between us which is the just cause." I fully concur in this request. But as I never

tried to throw dust into the eyes of anyone, I will go farther and say: If Mr. Salter is really in earnest, let him agree to the following proposal: Since it is now impossible for any reader to get back our past letters, if he thinks he has not been worsted in argument at every step, let us have this little controversy reproduced in pamphlet form to any number of copies he may name. We will evenly divide between ourselves the burden of the expense and get each one-half of the edition of said pamphlet to be distributed broadcast. I even volunteer to correct the proofs and see to the printing of the same. If Mr. Salter approves of this plan, I shall immediately send him my address. Will he accept this proposal? If he does not, our common readers will judge between ourselves.

TRUTH.

Winnipeg, Jan. 10.

LETTER IX.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I am congratulated for sticking to my text. I wish I could reciprocate congratulations to my opponent. In every letter I have asked him questions he will not face, whereas I do not know one of his yet unanswered. Mr. Truth has been trying to sidetrack the real issue. Every side issue is worthy space but must not predominate. The question from the beginning is the legality of the request of Roman Catholics to have denominational schools paid with public funds. Let Truth answer these questions plainly:

1st. Does not the law assert that no sectarian schools shall be supported with public funds?

2nd. Do the Roman Catholic people ask the Winnipeg School Board to support the sectarian schools, and even to pay for old buildings, and to receive dictation from a denomination as to the style of teachers engaged for these schools?

3rd. Has any court, supreme or otherwise, any Privy Council or any judicial body set aside the decision made that the law forbidding sectarian schools was *intra vires*?

4th. Do the Roman Catholic people not ask the Winnipeg School Board to do an illegal thing?

And now as to the decision of the Privy Council. I am sorry to read from the pen of Mr. Truth that the Roman Catholic advocate who lost the case for the Roman Catholic

Church was "an incompetent and ill-prepared advocate" because he lost a hopeless case (23). There was a day when Rome would have thanked an unsuccessful general who had done his best. If the Roman Catholics "received the decision of that tribunal with respect" I have read history backwards.

"Truth" has three times stated with quotation marks that the Privy Council decided that the Roman Catholic Church had a "right" to seek redress from the grievance. Mr. Editor I don't find it. Will he please state in his next letter where I will read this? Allow me to quote from that famous decision, the last one. "It may be that those who were acting on behalf of the Roman Catholic community of Manitoba were under the impression that its scope was wider and that it afforded protection greater than their lordships (in the first decision) held to be the case. But such considerations cannot properly influence the judgment of those who have judicially to interpret a statute. The question is not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said."

"The change to a Roman Catholic system of public schools would have been regarded with as much distaste by the Protestants of the province as the charge to an unsectarian" (not Protestant) "system was by the Catholics. The system of education embodied in the acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of, the great majority of the province."

There is not in the whole decision one hope held out to the Roman Catholic Church that they can legally establish

(23)—He was so, of course, because of the way he conducted his case, not because he lost it.

sectarian schools under present laws. I read of no word giving them "rights" or expressing their "grievances" but I do read that the "governor-general has power to make remedial orders, but it is not for this tribunal to intimate the precise steps to be taken."

If the Roman Catholics have a grievance, who has not (24)? We all have them, the only difference being that the Roman Catholic Church will not quit agitating till we have conceded everything to them and are subject to their authority (25). Once they get the upper hand in the matter they seek, and they at once have another grievance, till concession after concession is granted. I say it not with passion but with deep regret and well founded fear as to its consequences.

They will have a grievance as long as they have a wish, and they will object to and resist every fair and just attempt to place education on a common level. Every concession in schools has been granted them (26) but the concession to teach private creeds at public expense (27). On this there can be no compromise. It must not be done.

And now briefly to answer his other matter. I am reminded again of St. Mary's. It is not my business to asperse that

(24)—Is it possible that Mr. Salter at last admits that the Catholics have a grievance?

(25)—Who ever spoke of bringing Protestants under the heels of the Catholics? See how the latter, when in the majority, treat the former, for instance in Quebec. Such wild talk is scarcely worth noticing.

(26)—!!!!???

(27)—This singular charge of Mr. Salter's has already been refuted. Catholics are part of the "public", and they merely want the liberty of educating their children according to their conscience, a liberty they have long ago granted to the Protestants of Quebec. Of course, Mr. Salter is fully aware of that; but....

institution but to state that if superiority lies there, it is because the men who teach cannot teach French, because it is the one institution kept for reference and because a child can go there and hear no creed taught. This is my contention. Any school can be made efficient by being so conducted. If the Roman Catholic Church does not believe education to be rightly imparted without religion at every step, why do they give such education at St. Mary's? I am accused of ignorance of the names of different Roman Catholic institutions. Yes, I am ignorant of them and if such ignorance is serious I am hopeless.

Mr. Truth next deals with historical inaccuracies he claims to be in our text books. What would he substitute? The text-books of Quebec? If there is an error (he has not quoted one) could it not be remedied? and will not immediate steps be taken to do so?

Thus I think I have answered every matter dealt with. Let "Truth" do the same. He asks in closing: Will I have our controversy printed and scattered broadcast? Yes, gladly, but not in the middle of the discussion. I will bear half the expense and receive half the edition of same pamphlet if with it will be published the judgments of the lords of the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Jan. 18.

LETTER X.

By "Truth."

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—It was hard for me to repress a smile (let us not say of pity: there are truths which one has sometimes better keep to himself) when I read Mr. Salter's opening sentence to the effect that he could not reciprocate my congratulations on his having at last "tried" once to stick to the subject at issue between us. My questions to which no answer has been vouchsafed, and the points which he has deliberately avoided, have now become quite numerous; yet he placidly remarks that he does "not know one unanswered!" His letters have betrayed such a peculiar mentality that he has perhaps come almost to believe what he says. To mention but one of my questions, after having quoted from the judgment of the Privy Council which described the wrong done Catholics by the 1890 laws —so dear to Mr. Salter's heart—I had asked for the second time: "Has there been any change in the conditions pointed out?" Does my opponent at last answer me? Not in the least. He merely puts me some more questions concerning points which I have already elucidated. If he believes that people will not see the reason of that perpetual dodging, I cannot help believing that he is greatly mistaken.

Yet, though I do not consider myself bound to cover the same ground over again, I will, with your kind permission, answer for the second time his queries. He asks:

1st. "Does not the law assert that no sectarian schools shall be supported with public funds?" Of course it does; but that is precisely the law which the Privy Council declared to affect unduly the "rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education," and against which the noble Lords affirmed that "the appeal is well founded" (p. 12 of my copy of their judgment). Now is Mr. Salter satisfied at last? If the appeal of the Catholics against that legislation was "well founded," surely they had the "right" to seek redress. Moreover, that very word is used many times by the metropolitan judges, notably on pp. 9, 10, 11 and 12 of their decision such as reprinted by the Ottawa Government in 1895.

2nd. Mr. Salter would like to know whether Catholics do not ask the Winnipeg School Board to support the sectarian schools. Their memorandum on that subject is the best of answers I can give. If he will only read it before he again rushes to print, he will see that they simply ask that the taxes they pay for education be applied to the only schools they can conscientiously use, wherein teachers possessed of Government certificates and chosen according to law will teach, under the authority of the local School Board, which will rent the buildings they already occupy. Where does Mr. Salter see any "dictation" in this? This contention of his smacks of sectarian prejudices, to say the least.

Third question. "Has any Court.....set aside the decision made that the law forbidding sectarian schools was *intra vires*?" Why enquire about a point I so clearly explained in my last letter? The public surely tires of useless repetitions.

4th. "Do the Roman Catholic people not ask the Winnipeg School Board to do an illegal thing?" By no means. The legislation of 1890 having been recognized as interfering with the "rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority," rights and privileges which result from the contract entered into in 1870, any arrangement which will give back those "rights and privileges" is in strict conformity with the finding of the Privy Council, as I already stated in a previous letter. See second and third paragraphs of said letter.

Then, speaking of the decision of that supreme tribunal, Mr. Salter volunteers to serve us this pearl: "There is not in the whole decision one hope held out to the Roman Catholic Church [who ever spoke of her?] that they can legally establish sectarian schools under present laws. I read of no word giving them 'rights' or expressing their 'grievances.'" Now, Mr. Editor, I am loath to abuse of your kindness; but since my opponent is so blind and dull-minded, I must beg you to allow me space enough to enlighten him.... or others. Here are passages from the famous judgment which explain the situation and concern the grievances from which the Privy Council decided that Catholics had a right to seek redress:

"It must be remembered that the Provincial legislature is not in all respects supreme within the province.

"In relation to the subjects specified in section 92 of the British North America Act..... the exclusive power of the Provincial legislature may be said to be absolute. But this is not so as regards education..... It may be said to be anomalous that such a restriction as that in question should

be imposed on the free action of a legislature; but is it more anomalous than to grant to a minority who are aggrieved by legislation an appeal from the legislature to the executive authority? And yet [listen, Mr. Salter], and yet this right is expressly and beyond all controversy established" (p. 9).

Therefore, if the Catholic minority considered itself wronged by the 1890 legislature, it had the "right" to appeal against the same. Now, let us hear how the metropolitan judges find that said legislation does infringe upon the "rights and privileges" of Catholics, and therefore expose their grievances. I now quote from p. 11:

"The sole question to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their Lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer [does Mr. Salter understand?] Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the acts from which they appeal. Before those passed into law, there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools.

"What is the position of the Roman Catholic minority under the acts of 1890? Schools of their own denomination, conducted according to their views, will receive no aid from the

state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute fall alike on Catholics and Protestants. Moreover, while the Roman Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools, which they regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic children than if they were distinctively Protestant in their character.

"In view of this comparison, it does not seem possible to say that the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority in relation to education, which existed prior to 1890, have not been affected."

Now, will Mr. Salter tell us again: "I read of no word giving them 'rights' or expressing their 'grievances?'" Why, sir, the advocate of the wronged minority himself could not have been more explicit in exposing them! Their Lordships in conclusion reiterate (p. 12) that, 1st, the acts of 1890—those complained of by Catholics and to which Mr. Salter still fondly clings—affected rights and privileges legitimately possessed by them, and, 2nd, "Their Lordships have decided that the Governor-General in Council has jurisdiction [to make remedial orders] and that the appeal is well founded."

If Mr. Salter does not understand this, others will.

I have already pointed out so many blunders of that gentleman's with regard to Catholic institutions, that experience should have by this time taught him to keep shy of the latter. He is

not bound to know them; but no sensible person will speak, let alone write, about what he does not know. Starting from the ridiculous assumption that if St. Mary's parochial school is so superior it must be because its teachers have nothing to do with French (as if the ignorance of one language was a pledge of success in another), he affirms that "a child can go there and hear no creed taught." I wonder who may have been guilty of putting that strange idea into his head. It needs scarcely be remarked that there is in that school as much religion taught as in any other Catholic school of this city, but, of course, not half as much as Mr. Salter seems to believe there is. As to the question of French, this language is held a valuable accomplishment in St. Mary's Academy, whose pupils were but the other day so successful at the university examinations. But what in the world has the study of French to do with this question? Astray again, dear Mr. Salter; astray.

As to the mistakes in a history used in the public schools, I already referred Mr. Salter to Morice's "History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada," which I think he can get in any bookstore of this city. He can therefore find them whenever he pleases.

With regard to my proposal to publish in pamphlet form and disseminate our respective letters, that gentleman professes to agree to it; but he immediately after practically takes back with one hand what he has given with the other, since he puts to his acceptance of the same a condition which is so extraordinary that many will see in it a refusal to take up the gauntlet. It is that "the judgments of the lords of the judicial committee of the Privy Council" be published in the resulting pamphlet. I know of only one judgment relevant to the case

under discussion, and even that one judgment is so long that it would fill a dozen columns or so of the "Free Press." If my opponent insists on reproducing more than the decisional part of the same, it will, I believe, be hard for him to convince anyone that this condition is not in his heart of hearts intended to be prohibitive. Yet, Mr. Editor, I am so anxious to have the public judge between us, that I readily consent even to that quasi-prohibitive condition. Let Mr. Salter now tell me when we are going to put this into the hands of a printer.

TRUTH.

Winnipeg, Jan. 22.

LETTER XI.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I have read with interest the latest production from the pen of “Truth” and in reply just wish to point out one or two things to any one who may read quickly without meditation. I have but one point to bring forth in this letter, and it was for this I desired the decisions of the Privy Council to be printed with our discussion. This is the point: Mr. Truth makes quotations which he comments on in such a manner as to appear to be a continuity of the quotation (28). For instance, notice that although he acknowledges that the law asserts that no sectarian schools shall be supported with public funds, and also that no court has set aside that judgment, he actually so words his argument with sophistry as to endeavor to make you believe that a court which said: “It shall not be done” had, when appealed to again, said: “It shall not be, but it should be.” Now, Mr. Editor, no court ever did such a thing (29). If I may put the decision of the lords of the privy council in a sentence it will be this: “You Roman Catholics cannot by law have the schools you wish supported by public funds, but though we decide against you, we are sorry

(28)—I, on the contrary, constantly distinguish my comments from my quotations by the use of quotation marks which accompany only the latter, as the reader can see.

(29)—Neither, of course, did the Privy Council, and Mr. Salter has no warrant to imagine that I make that tribunal say so.

you cannot consider our schools suitable for the education of your children (30)." My conclusion is that the Roman Catholic people are asking the school board of Winnipeg to do an illegal thing when they ask them to do what the courts have decided should not be done (31).

In reply to all this, we are informed that the provincial legislature is not supreme in all respects within the province. Who then, according to Mr. Truth, is supreme? His answer would be: "The local school board of Winnipeg," for to them he makes his appeal. If redress is to be found for the position of the Romanists, my "blind and dullminded" intellect would suggest a higher court than is to be found within the province, but they have tried this to a conclusion, and the conclusion was against them.

In appearing to answer me regarding his quotation of "rights" and "privileges" I will leave the published pamphlet to the public to decide the case. My opponent makes a quotation and then uses the words "right" and "privilege" in a false connection which the public will see when their attention

(30)—This is the most fanciful interpretation I ever saw of a decision which plainly states that, 1st., "the Provincial Legislature [which made the 1890 law] is not in all respects supreme in the province;" 2nd., the right of appeal from its enactments on educational matters is "expressly and beyond all controversy established;" 3rd., "it does not seem possible to say that the rights and privileges of the Catholic minority in relation to education, which existed prior to 1890, have not been affected;" 4th., "the Governor-General in Council has jurisdiction [to make remedial orders] and, 5th., "the appeal [of the Catholics against the law depriving them of their schools] is well founded."

Even a child will see that, condensed in a few words, this means that the 1890 legislature did a real wrong to the Catholics and the latter have an undeniable right to get redress therefrom.

(31)—The courts never decided anything on this subject.

is called to it asking for their careful reading (32). Again note that the decision of the privy council states that "The proceeds of that assessment [for school purposes] are no longer destined to any extent [note to any extent] for the support of Catholic schools, but afford the means of maintaining schools which they [please note that "they" refers to Roman Catholics, and to no court of law] regard as no more suitable for the education of Catholic scholars than if they were distinctively Protestant in their character (33)." I have granted all along that they were considered by Roman Catholics in this light, but I also asserted often that nothing can satisfy them but complete control of everything (34).

Mr. Truth still refuses to quote errors of history he complains of, nor does he tell us what text books he would substitute. Perhaps the history which teaches that York is the capital of the province of Ontario (35). In conclusion, it is the sophistry of his argument I resent (36), but think careful readers are now in a position to judge for themselves the merits of the case, especially when they look to the decision of the

(32)—He would indeed be very clever, or endowed with remarkable powers of imagination, who would see anything of the kind.

(33)—Now this is precisely the part of the famous judgment which shows the wrong done the Catholic minority! Is Mr. Salter now going to assist, instead of opposing, me?

(34)—Mr. Salter's "assertions" in this connection are absolutely devoid of value until they are supported by proof.

(35)—York, known to-day as Toronto, was indeed the capital of Ontario. The book he refers to was written in France many years ago and does not display the wilful unfairness exhibited by the History I complain of. Its only defect consists in not being up-to-date, and because of this it makes a seeming mistake which cannot be compared with the eleven inaccuracies contained in one page of the "Story of the Canadian People."

(36)—And which nobody but himself will see.

Privy Council for a statement that the law affects "unduly" the rights and privileges of the minority (37).

Perhaps one other matter may be mentioned. It is the question of supervision of such schools. Of course, they would permit no supervision by any inspector or official but one of their own selection, and for the benefit of the readers I should like to remark that they have this supervision in some schools in Manitoba today. What kind of supervision is it when they choose their own? They ask for their schools to be rented, their teachers to be selected by themselves and paid by the government, their choice of everything, while everybody else is subject to authority of law.

Mr. Editor, the time has come to publish. Let Mr. Truth correspond with me (I do not know who he is) and we will arrange for the publication. And all who wish copies will doubtless be able to get them from him or from myself.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Jan. 25.

(37)—They concede that it affects them unduly since they decide that "the appeal (against it) is well founded." It stands to reason that an appeal against a law that properly affects rights or privileges would not be well founded.

LETTER XII.

By "Truth."

"TRUTH'S" FINAL LETTER.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I had noticed from the beginning of our little controversy that Mr. Salter was of an exceedingly kind disposition—else he would have tried to render more difficult my task of answering him by avoiding those patent misconceptions, false statements, baseless accusations and glaring errors which it was so easy for me to refute. But I confess that I never suspected he would show himself so generous as he has done in his parting letter. Through kindness of heart (or is it owing to an unwarrantable obstinacy, or something else?) he penned his last communication in such a way that almost any schoolboy who has studied contemporary history would have no difficulty in answering it. For, in spite of my so plain and telling quotations from the judgment of the Privy Council anent the rights and grievances of the Manitoba Catholics in educational matters, he persists in seeing in it a condemnation, rather than an acknowledgement, of their claims. "They have tried it to a conclusion," he says, "and the conclusion was against them." I am sure that most advocates of the public schools who know anything of the history of the question must, by this time, heartily regret to have had a champion who can learn so little as Mr. Salter has proved himself to be.

Of course, Mr. Editor, we all know that, when in 1895 the final decision of the Privy Council was made known, both Liberals and Conservatives agreed that the Catholics were

legally the victors in the bitter conflict. Pursuant to their petition, based on that very decision, the Conservatives tried to pass through parliament a remedial order issued March 19, 1895, which had for its object to put an end to the wrong pointed out by that judgment, while the Liberals were as unanimous in acknowledging that the rights of the Catholics had been recognized at London. Hence their own attempt to conform themselves to the decision of the metropolitan judges as soon as they came into power. Yet, in the face of this unanimity, it seems that there is now in Canada one solitary individual who is unaware of this, and that individual is the Rev. E. J. B. Salter. I need not expatiate on this strange psychological case; the readers of the forthcoming pamphlet will themselves draw their own conclusions on this point.

I have quoted in my last letter almost the whole decisional part of the all-important judgment on which Catholics base their claims. Any impartial reader will see that, instead of having recourse to sophistry, as the self-appointed defender of a hopeless cause would fain have us believe, I have, on the contrary, been as plain and to the point as possible, faithfully reproducing within quotation marks what was not mine and mentioning even the page from which I was quoting. But such is the incomprehensible cloudiness of my adversary's mind that he now reproaches me with dicta which in reality belong to the Privy Council and were given as such! "We are informed," he says, "that the provincial legislature is not supreme in all respects within the province. Who, then, according to Mr. Truth, is supreme?" Well, my dear sir, I am very sorry for you, but this contention is not mine; it must be put to the credit of the judges of the Privy Council themselves, and, as I said

in my last, this sentence (which I had within quotation marks) is to be found on page 9 of their official decision! Verily, I wonder what can the matter be with my opponent.

A little further on, he reproduces after me the very text which embodies the grievances of the Catholics without, apparently, as much as understanding its import, since he makes within brackets remarks which are entirely irrelevant (see third paragraph of his letter). In fact, he actually seems to take as what is decided the very condition of affairs on which the noble lords base their strictures and which they instance as a proof of the reality of the Catholics' grievances!

He finally gives it as a fact that, were their schools taken over by the school board, Catholics "would permit no supervision by any inspector or official but one of their own selection," and that "they have this supervision in some schools in Manitoba today." I need scarcely say that Mr. Salter's remarks are, as usual, quite wide of the mark. Catholics never asked for any but a government inspector, and no other kind of supervising official exists today in Manitoba.

And now we must part—as far at least as the columns of your valuable paper are concerned. With this I send to the Manitoba Free Press Publishing Company an accepted cheque for \$25 as an instalment towards defraying half of the expense consequent on the publication of our little controversy in pamphlet form. As soon as I learn that Mr. Salter has done the same, I shall write to him under my real name and take steps to have the same reprinted. In the meantime, I must be allowed to ask that none of the letters we may exchange be regarded as confidential. Should any one of us back out,

the other must be at liberty to tell the public the reason why.

TRUTH.

Winnipeg, Jan. 29.

Ed. Note.—The Free Press has returned his cheque to "Truth" suggesting that he put himself in direct communication with the Rev. E. J. B. Salter.—Ed. F.P.

LETTER XIII.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter.

E. J. B. SALTER'S FINAL LETTER.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—In the last letter of a debate no new material can be introduced, nor, indeed, is it in this case necessary. A reference to our letters will reveal no answer made by myself to anything personal, not even when I was "given the lie." So, now, let others judge where my "patent misconceptions, false statements, baseless accusations and glaring errors" are.

Truth says that I persist in seeing a condemnation rather than acknowledgement of the Roman Catholic claims in the decision of the Privy Council. Let me ask you, sir, could any court acknowledge any person's claim to be just and yet decide against him? Never. He informs us that when the decision was made known, "both Liberals and Conservatives agreed that the Catholics were legally the victors in the bitter conflict." Well might the advocates of the public schools who know anything of the question heartily regret to have had for a champion "one whose mind is so 'cloudy'" as mine if this is so, for really I cannot see how a party can lose his case in court and be the legal victor (38). I am without words to express my wonder that any person should take such a stand. But, when I am further informed that "Liberals and Conservatives

(38)—Neither can I; but I can see, in common with everybody except Mr. Salter, that he does not "lose his case in court," but is "the legal victor," who is told by that same court that his "appeal is well founded." See again Note 30.

agreed" and yet the "legal victor" has not gained his point, it is a climax (39).

Mr. Truth repudiates sophistry. Let each of his answers be put with my questions, and let the readers judge. Just to instance. I asked: "Do not the Roman Catholics request the Winnipeg school board to support sectarian schools and even to pay for old buildings and to receive dictation from a denomination as to the style of teachers engaged for these schools?" His answer is: "Their memorandum on that subject is the best answer I can give," etc. Read his whole quotation. And re the question of dictation, his answer is, "Where does Mr. Salter see any dictation in this?" The Roman Catholic Church is to dictate the curriculum, dictate the style of teachers engaged, dictate what buildings are to be used, dictate for inspectors of their faith, and I am asked "Where do I see dictation in this?" This is the form of answer I get right along. No answer, Yes or No, to anything. Take my next question: "Has any court set aside the decision?" etc. His answer is, "Why inquire about a point I so clearly explained in my last letter?" Is there any reply here? And when, in my last, I said the Roman Catholics would permit no supervision by any inspector or official but of their own selection, he hedges by the quibble that they never asked for any but a government inspector. It is all of a piece with the other arguments. I know they want a government-paid inspector, government-hired buildings, government-paid teachers; but I still assert that

(39)—For unadulterated sophistry and probably wilful inability to see what is clear as daylight when freed from the distortion to which it is disingenuously subjected by Mr. Salter, this is indeed a climax!

the choice of such buildings, teachers, inspectors, remains and would be controlled by the Church of Rome, and their inspectors would not dare oppose the wishes of the authoritative church who would by this means supervise and inspect its own institutions.

Mr. Editor, it must not be. If the government appoints a Roman Catholic to inspect our schools nobody raises a question. If a Roman Catholic teacher teaches my children I do not object. I insist on the right of a government to appoint its officers regardless of creed. And now let Mr. Truth correspond with me, as he suggested, and we will publish. I thank you for the courtesy you have extended us for your space for this controversy.

E. J. B. SALTER.

Winnipeg, Feb. 5.

LETTER XIV (40).

By Rev. A. G. Morice, O.M.I., ("Truth").

To the reader:—

The Rev. Mr. Salter having written in his letter of Jan. 25, that "the time has come to publish," I answered his communication by remarks which I gave out as final, and whereby I not only accepted the hint, but took the first practical step towards publishing our controversy in pamphlet form, conformably to my own suggestion as per letter VIII. My opponent has, however, come out again with another letter which contains statements which I cannot possibly leave unchallenged. I should be all the more free to comment on it as my own communications have so far been mere replies to his letters, and it seems to me that the most elementary fairness wants the right of answer to correspond in every case to the right of attack.

My reverend adversary commences his last letter by remarking that he has throughout abstained from personalities. I am glad to be able to concur in that certificate of good conduct which he awards to himself. At the same time, there are perhaps some who will observe that I have not given him any excuse for returning my strictures on the peculiar character of his reasoning. I never had the least intention to hurt his feelings; but the kind of "logic" he too often resorted to was bound to elicit from a controversialist any but flattering comments.

(40)—This, *minus* the footnotes and three or four sentences, is the letter which Mr. Salter refused to admit into our proposed joint publication.

He likewise seems to resent my contention that he gave vent to "patent misconceptions, false statements, baseless accusations and glaring errors." In self-defence, and to show him that said contention was really founded on facts, I must be allowed to recapitulate herewith the deficiencies at which I thereby hinted.

1st. Rev. Mr. Salter has repeatedly asserted that we were asking for privileges (41). I have proved him by the very words of the judges of the Privy Council that we wanted nothing but our rights. This is a first "misconception."

2nd. He had written that only 20 of our scholars had passed their entrance into the High Schools (42). I have showed this to be a "false statement" by declaring that, in two of our schools alone, no less than 37 had passed.

3rd. He had implicitly stated that Dr. Fallon had been 25 years a bishop (43). A "glaring error," since that ecclesiastic has been a prelate only two years.

4th. Mr. Salter was in this connection guilty of another "misconception," since he thought that said bishop was referring to separate schools, while his remarks bore on another kind of institution (44).

5th. It was also a "false statement" for him to make me say that our schools "do not want" their pupils to graduate

(41)—See pp. 14, 15, 25, 31, 32, 34, 41.

(42)—See p. 12.

(43)—P. 13,

(44)—*Ibid.*

(45), a remark for which I proved my adversary to have had no warrant.

6th. The parish priest of Beauséjour has furthermore convinced him of making a "false statement" with reference to the pretended arrest at his place of a man who was never seen there (46).

7th. He had also been making a "baseless accusation", when he depreciated our schools (47), which I have shown to be every way up to the standard of the public schools, if not superior in efficiency.

8th. He furthermore published the "false statement" that if the public schools of Winnipeg were without religion, the Catholics of that city were to blame for it (48), while he must know that for the last 22 years the latter never had anything to do with them and Protestants gave them the character that suited themselves and not Catholics.

9th. He was moreover guilty of a "glaring error" when he unblushingly stated that the Catholics of Winnipeg were not paying double school tax (49).

10th. He explicitly wrote of the Catholics that "they are asking for public money to teach private creeds" (50), a "patent misconception," as I plainly showed.

(45)—P. 24.

(46)—See p. 14 and note 5.

(47)—PP. 12, 13.

(48)—PP. 23, 33.

(49)—P. 24.

(50)—See first line of p. 24 and also p. 32.

11th. It was also a “misconception” on his part to claim that the granting of separate schools to the Catholics would entail the establishment of similar institutions for every Protestant sect (51), and that for two reasons which I clearly set forth.

12th. Mr. Salter had written that if Protestant children entering a Catholic school had to be set a grade lower, “it was because they cannot pass the religious grade test (52).” Another “misconception.”

13th. He also supposed that we based the superiority of our scholars on their knowledge of French (53); still another “misconception.”

14th. Then he confounded St. Mary’s Academy with St. Mary’s parochial school (54), a “misconception” all the more “patent” as I had explicitly differentiated both institutions. “In *two* schools alone, namely, St. Mary’s Academy *and* St. Mary’s parochial school . . . ,” I had written in my first letter (p. 19).

15th. But the most “glaring” of Mr. Salter’s “errors” consisted in his quoting from the 1892 judgment as if this had been the 1895 judgment (55).

16th. He was also making a “false statement” when, in his fifth letter—the ninth of this pamphlet—he contended that

(51)—P. 32.

(52)—P. 33.

(53)—P. 32.

(54)—P. 43. He speaks of the “men” who teach at St. Mary’s Academy!

(55)—P. 44.

the decision of the Privy Council contained "no word giving them [the Catholics] rights or expressing their grievances (56)."

17th. It was likewise a "baseless accusation" to write as Mr. Salter did (Letter IX) that "the Roman Catholic Church will not quit agitating till we are subject to their authority (57)." He knows full well that in school or church matters, the Quebec majority never dreamt of subjecting Protestants to its authority, and he has no excuse for thinking that the Manitoba *minority* would do in this province what the Quebec *majority* does not dream of doing in the East.

18th. A further "misconception" of his expressed in the same letter was to the effect that no religion was taught in St. Mary's school (58).

19th. Still another one was betrayed by his attributing to me a contention which in reality belonged to the lords of the Privy Council, namely that concerning the extent of the powers of the provincial legislature (59).

20th. The careful reader will no doubt see another "baseless accusation" in my opponent's claim that I make quotations "which I comment on in such a manner as to appear to be a continuity (he means "continuation") of the text (60)," while, as a matter of fact, any one can see by referring to my letters that my own comments are plainly distinguished from any quotations by the absence of quotation marks in the former.

(56)—P. 53.

(57)—*Ibid.*

(58)—P. 54.

(59)—P. 63.

(60)—P. 62.

21st. It was also certainly a "false statement" to write as did my adversary that Catholics "would permit no supervision by any inspector or official but one of their own selection and . . . that they have this supervision in some schools in Manitoba today (61)."

22nd. Lastly, in the face of the so decisive excerpts from the judgment of the Privy Council which I have quoted, it is at least a "false statement" to assert, as Mr. Salter does, that that tribunal decided against Catholics (62).

Is this enough? Yet I confine myself to the points which I took up in my replies, and though I had constantly to seek brevity and pass over many assertions to which I could have taken objection. I hope that the reader will now have little difficulty in finding where Mr. Salter's "patent misconceptions, false statements, baseless accusations and glaring errors" are.

"It is human to err, but devilish to persevere" in one's errors, says a Latin proverb. Shall this be applied to my friend with the anti-Catholic school proclivities? Controversialists will surely envy my good luck in having to deal with one who is so impervious even to self-evident facts as Mr. Salter has proved to be. Is it really possible that he is still unable to see the real import of the 1895 judgment of the Privy Council, an import which Liberals as well as Conservatives immediately grasped, and on which all the attempts at settlement of the school question have ever been based? To judge from his

(61)—P. 65.

(62)—PP. 63, 64, 70.

last letter, such is apparently the case. There is nobody so blind as he who will not see. Against such a disposition I am evidently powerless. But the reader will not fail to remember the terms of the decision of the Privy Council (Letter X) which, 1st, recognize most clearly that the Catholics of Manitoba have a real grievance; 2nd, that they have the right to seek redress at the hands of the Governor-General in Council (that is practically the Federal Parliament) and 3rd, that their last appeal from a judgment to the contrary was "well founded."

Yet with all this before his eyes Mr. Salter still contends that Catholics have not been the victors in the legal struggle! To have gained their point, they should apparently have been told that, 1st, they had no real grievance; 2nd, the Governor-General in Council could do nothing for them, and 3rd, their appeal was "not" well founded.

This will strike most readers as ridiculous, but not Mr. Salter. For does he not say in his last letter: "I cannot see how a party can lose his case in court and be the legal victor?" If the Catholics lost their case, why did the Conservatives attempt in 1895 to pass the remedial bill which drove them from power, and why did Laurier offer them in 1897 his abortive settlement of the school question? According to Mr. Salter, it must no doubt have been because the Catholics had lost their case in London, because they had been told that they had no real grievance and no possible recourse to the Federal Parliament!

Beaten at every step, Mr. Salter would fain attribute his defeat to sophistry. He reproaches me with not giving a direct answer to his questions and says, for instance: "I asked:

'Do not the Roman Catholics request the Winnipeg school board to support sectarian schools and to pay for old buildings, etc. His [mine] answer is: "Their memorandum on that subject is the best answer I can give." Is not this plain and to the point? The Catholics' petition set forth in full their demands, and why should one be debarred from referring to it under pain of being accused of sophistry? This is, of course, the most unfounded of charges.

Then, taking his own prejudices as real facts, he goes on to remark: "The Roman Catholic Church is to dictate the curriculum, dictate the style of teachers engaged, dictate what buildings are to be used, dictate for inspectors of their faith, and I am asked: Where do I see dictation in this?" Now, sir, does not your conscience tell you that it is not honest to give as facts idle suppositions, some of which I have already disproved, then work yourself up to a high pitch of indignation and make me ask "Where do you see any dictation in this," while you know perfectly well that this query of mine referred to an altogether different state of affairs? In answer to your charge of dictation, I had referred you to the memorandum of the Catholics (Letter X) wherein, I had remarked, you will see that "they simply ask that the taxes they pay for education be applied to the only schools they can conscientiously use, wherein teachers possessed of government certificates [therefore not any teachers of their own selection], chosen according to law [mind again my words] will teach under the authority of the local school board." Such are my words, such are the only authentic facts as set forth in the Catholics' very petition, and not the elucubrations of a prejudiced mind. Was I not justified in asking where you saw dictation in this?

Is objecting to double taxes what a person would call dictating, any more than consenting to take for teachers only those who are provided with government certificates, and volunteering to put them "under the authority of the local school board?" Once again, where is dictation in this? The least one can expect from a minister of the Gospel is honesty.

The rest of Mr. Salter's final letter is on a par with this, and therefore needs not detain us any longer. No intelligent reader, for instance, will see the least trace of sophistry in the fact that I refer him to a previous letter, especially when I go to the trouble of pointing out the paragraphs where he will find my answer to his question. This was tantamount to telling him that I did not feel in duty bound to answer him twice on the same subject, and that useless repetitions are as objectionable to the publisher as they are tedious to the reader.

Finally, as if he were desirous of destroying the impression of narrow-mindedness which Mr. Salter himself must feel has been created by the role he has played in this whole controversy, he ends by the following: "If the government appoints a Roman Catholic to inspect our schools nobody raises a question. If a Roman Catholic teacher teaches my children I do not object." Were these declarations really sincere, one might take the trouble to ask him why then he objects to a Catholic inspecting Catholic schools; but a little incident which has just come to my notice is well calculated to tell us with how many grains of salt the expression of these lofty sentiments must be taken. The reader may as well learn that my opponent is a prominent official of the Protestant Bible Society which has its seat in Winnipeg. Now as I am penning these very lines,

some 450 miles from that city, I receive the following communication:

"Mr. H. M., contractor of Winnipeg, tendered on a building for the Bible Society. His tender was the lowest, and he was notified to call and sign the contract. When he arrived, the Rev. Mr. Salter informed him that they had discovered that he (M.) was a Roman Catholic, and that they would not allow him to build the building. Mr. Thos. R. was present at the time."

On the above I shall offer no other comment than this: Among the employees of the Catholic publishing company which is to print this and reprint what of the foregoing has appeared in the "Free Press," the two most prominent, the foreman and the estimator, together with a large number of their subordinates, are Protestants.

And now it may be that Mr. Salter will realize that he has gained nothing by trying to suppress my answer to a letter which he should never have written. I end by signing my real name, in accordance with his own wish verbally expressed to me.

A. G. MORICE, O.M.I.

Saskatoon, Sask., Feb. 22nd, 1913.

P.S.—In a private letter Mr. Salter remarks that H. M.'s tender was not the lowest. But he does not tell me why that party was called to sign the contract and why, once arrived at Mr. Salter's headquarters, he was not allowed to so do.

A. G. M.

LETTER XV.

By Rev. E. J. B. Salter

THE ROMAN CATHOLICS AND THEIR
SCHOOLS

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir.—It will be remembered by your readers that under the above title a controversy was conducted between myself and a priest who signed himself “Truth.” This controversy we agreed to print, each paying half the cost, and each receiving half the copies. We met together at the printer’s office and placed an order for 2,000 copies. My opponent asked at that time the privilege of writing an extra letter which had not appeared in the Free Press. To this I gave consent, providing the letter was first submitted to me for my approval. The letter was of a nature I could not accept, whereupon my opponent has withdrawn from the arrangement and I have arranged to print the pamphlet myself. I am writing to state that those who wish a copy may have one from me upon application. It occupies about 80 pages and is sent free.

E. J. B. SALTER.

165 Cathedral Ave., Winnipeg, April 1.

LETTER XVI.

By "Truth."

"TRUTH" MAKES EXPLANATION.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—On the 2nd. inst. you published a letter by the Rev. E. J. B. Salter, my quondam antagonist in a controversy on the Manitoba school question wherein I appeared under the nom de plume of "Truth." I then sent you for publication a few remarks to set myself right in the eyes of the public, who could not but form a wrong opinion of the motives which made me follow the only course which I considered was left me under the circumstances. As these remarks have, I am now told, never reached you, I beg to submit herewith the substance of the same.

Rev Mr. Salter went to the trouble of telling your readers that I had withdrawn from the compact whereby I was to defray half the expense of publishing our little controversy in pamphlet form, and I know that in the booklet which is now being printed for him he devotes a whole page to the same purpose. But in neither case does he give the real reason of my conduct in this connection. Hence this communication.

He had ended his sixth letter by declaring that "the time has now come to publish. Let Mr. Truth correspond with me (I do not know who he is) and we will arrange for the publication." Whereupon, after answering that communication, thinking that he himself considered our controversy at an

end, I sent you a cheque to cover part of the expense of its publication. This you returned me, and at your suggestion I had a personal interview with my opponent.

Great was then my surprise to learn that, in spite of his aforesaid declaration, he had written still another letter, which he said would appear in the Free Press. I remarked that, as my part had been to "defend" the Catholic side of the question against his attacks, if his new communication was printed I should be allowed to answer it at least in the forthcoming pamphlet.

After some hesitation he consented to this, but when he saw my answer he would not have it, pretexts sometimes that it was too long, and sometimes that the nature of its contents was not to his taste—as if he had expected me to agree with him! To meet the former objection I offered to take upon myself the expense of its publication, and to do away with the latter I volunteered to strike off its final and most telling part. But he stubbornly rejected all my advances. Therefore deeming that he who is bold enough to attack should be manly enough to allow his adversary the privilege of defending himself in every instance, and seeing that this was refused me, I had regretfully to withdraw from the arrangement I had myself proposed and for the execution of which I had even sent you my cheque.

This does not mean that I consider myself committed henceforth to a policy of silence. I, too, may publish; but if I do so, instead of omitting one of our letters and of replacing it by extraneous matter as Mr. Salter has done, I shall give my

readers the benefit of the integral controversy without the addition of irrelevant quotations.

Thanking you for your courtesy and the space you have allowed me in the course of this controversy, I remain

Sincerely yours,

A. G. MORICE, O.M.I.

(alias "Truth").

Winnipeg, April 10, 1913.

